arXiv:0704.0772v1 [math.NA] 5 Apr 2007

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
NUMERICAL ANALYSIS AND MODELING
Volume 1, Number 1, Pages 1–18

© 2007 Institute for Scientific
Computing and Information

STABILITY OF A COLOCATED FINITE VOLUME SCHEME FOR THE INCOMPRESSIBLE NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS

SÉBASTIEN ZIMMERMANN

(Communicated by Jean-Luc Guermond)

Abstract. We introduce a finite volume scheme for the two-dimensional incompressible Navier-Stokes equations. We use a triangular mesh. The unknowns for the velocity and pressure are both piecewise constant (colocated scheme). We use a projection (fractional-step) method to deal with the incompressibility constraint. We prove that the differential operators in the Navier-Stokes equations and their discrete counterparts share similar properties. In particular, we state an inf-sup (Babuška-Brezzi) condition. We infer from it the stability of the scheme.

Key Words. Incompressible fluids, Navier-Stokes equations, projection methods and finite volume.

1. Introduction

We consider the flow of an incompressible fluid in a open bounded set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ during the time interval $[0,T]$. The velocity field $\mathbf{u} : \Omega \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}^2$ and the pressure field $p : \Omega \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the Navier-Stokes equations

$$\mathbf{u}_t - \frac{1}{\mathrm{Re}}\,\boldsymbol{\Delta}\mathbf{u} + (\mathbf{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla})\mathbf{u} + \nabla p = \mathbf{f}\,, \tag{1.1}$$

$$\operatorname{div}\,\mathbf{u} = 0\,, \tag{1.2}$$

with the boundary and initial condition

$$\mathbf{u}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\,, \qquad\qquad \mathbf{u}|_{t=0} = \mathbf{u}_0.$$

The terms $\boldsymbol{\Delta}\mathbf{u}$ and $(\mathbf{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla})\mathbf{u}$ are respectively associated with the physical phenomena of diffusion and convection. The Reynolds number Re measures the influence of convection in the flow. For equations (1.1)–(1.2), finite element and finite difference methods are well known and mathematical studies are available (see [10] for example). Numerous computations have also been conducted with finite volume schemes (*e.g.* [14] and [1]). However, in this case, few mathematical results are available. Let us cite Eymard and Herbin [7] and Eymard, Latché and Herbin [8]. In order to deal with the incompressibility constraint (1.2), these works use a penalization method. Another way is to use the projection methods which have been introduced by Chorin [4] and Temam [15]. This is the case in Faure [9]. In this work, however, the mesh is made of squares, so that the geometry of the problem is limited. Therefore, we introduce in what follows a finite volume scheme on triangular meshes for equations (1.1)–(1.2), using a projection method. An interesting feature of this scheme is that the unknowns for the velocity and

---

Received by the editors April 1, 2007 and, in revised form, April 1, 2007.
2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 76M12, 76B99.

pressure are both piecewise constant (colocated scheme). It leads to an economic computer storage, and allows an easy generalization of the scheme to the 3D case. The layout of the article is the following. We first introduce (section 2) some notations and hypotheses on the mesh. We define (section 2.2) the spaces we use to approximate the velocity and pressure. We define also (section 2.3) the operators we use to approximate the differential operators in (1.1)–(1.2). Combining this with a projection method, we build the scheme in section 3. In order to provide a mathematical analysis for the scheme, we prove in section 4 that the differential operators in (1.1)–(1.2) and their discrete counterparts share similar properties. In particular, the discrete operators for the gradient and the divergence are adjoint. Also, the discrete gradient operator is a consistent approximation of its continuous counterpart. The discrete operator for the convection term is positive, stable and consistent. The discrete operator for the divergence satisfies an inf-sup (Babuška-Brezzi) condition. From these properties we deduce in section 5 the stability of the scheme.

We conclude with some notations. The spaces $(L^2, |.|)$ and $(L^\infty, \|.\|_\infty)$ are the usual Lebesgue spaces and we set $L^2_0 = \{q \in L^2\,;\int_\Omega q(\mathbf{x})\,d\mathbf{x} = 0\}$. Their vectorial counterparts are $(\mathbb{L}^2, |.|)$ and $(\mathbb{L}^\infty, \|.\|_\infty)$ with $\mathbb{L}^2 = (L^2)^2$ and $\mathbb{L}^\infty = (L^\infty)^2$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $(H^k, \|\cdot\|_k)$ is the usual Sobolev space. Its vectorial counterpart is $(\mathbf{H}^k, \|.\|_k)$ with $\mathbf{H}^k = (H^k)^2$. For $k = 1$, the functions of $\mathbf{H}^1$ with a null trace on the boundary form the space $\mathbf{H}^1_0$. Also, we set $\boldsymbol{\nabla}\mathbf{u} = (\nabla u_1, \nabla u_2)^T$ if $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2) \in \mathbf{H}^1$. If $\mathbf{X} \subset \mathbb{L}^2$ is a Banach space, we define $\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbf{X})$ (resp. $L^2(0,T;\mathbf{X})$) as the set of the applications $\mathbf{g} : [0,T] \to \mathbf{X}$ such that $t \to |\mathbf{g}(t)|$ is continous (resp. square integrable). The norms $\|.\|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbf{X})}$ and $\|.\|_{L^2(0,T;\mathbf{X})}$ are defined respectively by $\|\mathbf{g}\|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbf{X})} = \sup_{t\in[0,T]} |\mathbf{g}(t)|$ and $\|\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(0,T;\mathbf{X})} = \left(\int_0^T |g(t)|^2\,ds\right)^{1/2}$. In all calculations, C is a generic positive constant, depending only on Ω, $\mathbf{u}_0$ and $\mathbf{f}$.

2. Discrete setting

First, we introduce the spaces and the operators needed to build the scheme.

2.1. The mesh. Let $\mathcal{T}_h$ be a triangular mesh of Ω: $\overline{\Omega} = \cup_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} K$. For each triangle $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, we denote by $|K|$ its area and $\mathcal{E}_K$ the set of his edges. If $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K$, $\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}$ is the unit vector normal to σ pointing outward of K.

The set of edges of the mesh is $\mathcal{E}_h = \cup_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\mathcal{E}_K$. The length of an edge $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h$ is $|\sigma|$ and its middle point $\mathbf{x}_\sigma$. The set of edges located inside Ω (resp. on its boundary) is $\mathcal{E}_h^{int}$ (resp. $\mathcal{E}_h^{ext}$): $\mathcal{E}_h = \mathcal{E}_h^{int} \cup \mathcal{E}_h^{ext}$. If $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}$, K_σ and L_σ are the triangles sharing σ as an edge. If $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{ext}$, only the triangle K_σ inside Ω is defined.

We denote by $\mathbf{x}_K$ the circumcenter of a triangle K. We assume that the measure of all interior angles of the triangles of the mesh are below $\frac{\pi}{2}$, so that $\mathbf{x}_K \in K$. If $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}$ (resp. $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{ext}$) we set $d_\sigma = d(\mathbf{x}_{K_\sigma}, \mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma})$ (resp. $d_\sigma = d(\mathbf{x}_\sigma, \mathbf{x}_{K_\sigma})$). We define for all edge $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h$

$$\tau_\sigma = \frac{|\sigma|}{d_\sigma}. \tag{2.1}$$

The maximum circumradius of the triangles of the mesh is h. We assume ([6] p. 776) that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\forall\,\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h, \qquad d(\mathbf{x}_{K_\sigma}, \sigma) \geq C|\sigma| \quad \text{and} \quad |\sigma| \geq Ch.$$

It implies that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\forall\,\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h\,, \qquad \tau_\sigma \geq C\,, \tag{2.2}$$

and for all triangles $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ we have (with $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K$ and $h_{K,\sigma}$ the matching altitude)

$$|K| = \frac{1}{2}\,|\sigma|\,h_{K,\sigma} \geq \frac{1}{2}\,|\sigma|\,d(\mathbf{x}_K,\mathbf{x}_\sigma) \geq C\,h^2. \tag{2.3}$$

Lastly, if $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and $L \in \mathcal{T}_h$ are two triangles sharing the edge $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}$, we define

$$\alpha_{K,L} = \frac{d(\mathbf{x}_L,\mathbf{x}_\sigma)}{d(\mathbf{x}_K,\mathbf{x}_L)}.$$

Let us notice that $\alpha_{K,L} \in [0,1]$ and $\alpha_{K,L} + \alpha_{L,K} = 1$.

2.2. The discrete spaces.

We first define

$$P_0 = \{q \in L^2 \;;\; \forall\, K \in \mathcal{T}_h,\;\; q|_K \text{ is a constant}\}\,, \qquad \mathbf{P}_0 = (P_0)^2.$$

For the sake of concision, we set for all $q_h \in P_0$ (resp. $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$) and all triangle $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$: $q_K = q_h|_K$ (resp. $\mathbf{v}_K = \mathbf{v}_h|_K$). Although $\mathbf{P}_0 \not\subset \mathbf{H}^1$, we define the discrete equivalent of a $\mathbf{H}^1$ norm as follows. For all $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ we set

$$\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h = \left(\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \tau_\sigma\,|\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}|^2 + \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{ext}} \tau_\sigma\,|\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}|^2\right)^{1/2} \tag{2.4}$$

where τ_σ is given by (2.1). We have [6] a Poincaré-like inequality for $\mathbf{P}_0$: there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$

$$|\mathbf{v}_h| \leq C\,\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h. \tag{2.5}$$

We also have the following inverse inequality.

Proposition 2.1. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$*

$$h\,\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h \leq C\,|\mathbf{v}_h|.$$

Proof. According to (2.4)

$$h^2\,\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h^2 = \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} h^2\,\tau_\sigma\,|\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}|^2 + \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{ext}} h^2\,\tau_\sigma\,|\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}|^2.$$

We deduce from (2.2) and (2.3) that $h^2\,\tau_\sigma \leq C\,|K_\sigma|$ and $h^2\,\tau_\sigma \leq C\,|L_\sigma|$. Thus, since $|\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}|^2 \leq 2\left(|\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma}|^2 + |\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}|^2\right)$, we get

$$h^2\,\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h^2 \leq C \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \left(|K_\sigma|\,|\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}|^2 + |L_\sigma|\,|\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma}|^2\right) + C \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{ext}} |K_\sigma|\,|\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}|^2.$$

Hence $h^2\,\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h^2 \leq C\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} |K|\,|\mathbf{v}_K|^2 \leq C\,|\mathbf{v}_h|^2$. ■

From the norm $\|.\|_h$ we deduce a dual norm. For all $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ we set

$$\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{-1,h} = \sup_{\boldsymbol{\psi}_h\in\mathbf{P}_0} \frac{(\mathbf{v}_h,\boldsymbol{\psi}_h)}{\|\boldsymbol{\psi}_h\|_h}. \tag{2.6}$$

For all $\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ and $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ we have $(\mathbf{u}_h,\mathbf{v}_h) \leq \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_{-1,h}\,\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h$. Now we introduce some operators on P_0 and $\mathbf{P}_0$. We define the projection operator $\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} : \mathbb{L}^2 \to \mathbf{P}_0$ as follows. For all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{L}^2$, $\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{P}_0$ is given by

$$\forall\, K \in \mathcal{T}_h\,, \qquad (\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{w})|_K = \frac{1}{|K|}\int_K \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x})\,d\mathbf{x}. \tag{2.7}$$

We easily check that for all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{L}^2$ and $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ we have $(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_h) = (\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_h)$. It implies that $\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}$ is stable for the $\mathbb{L}^2$ norm. We define also the interpolation operator $\widetilde{\Pi}_{P_0} : H^2 \to P_0$. For all $q \in H^2$, $\widetilde{\Pi}_{P_0} q \in P_0$ is given by

$$\forall\, K \in \mathcal{T}_h\,, \qquad \widetilde{\Pi}_{P_0} q|_K = q(\mathbf{x}_K).$$

According to the Sobolev embedding theorem, $q \in H^2$ is a.e. equal to a continuous function. Therefore the definition above makes sense. We also set $\widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0} = (\widetilde{\Pi}_{P_0})^2$. The operator $\widetilde{\Pi}_{P_0}$ (resp. $\widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}$) is naturally stable for the L^∞ (resp. $\mathbb{L}^\infty$) norm. One also checks ([2] and [16]) that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$|\mathbf{v} - \Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{v}| \le C\, h\, \|\mathbf{v}\|_1\,, \qquad |q - \widetilde{\Pi}_{P_0} q| \le C\, h\, \|q\|_2 \tag{2.8}$$

for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^1$ and $q \in H^2$.
We introduce the finite element spaces

$$\begin{aligned} P_1^d &= \{v \in L^2\,;\ \forall\, K \in \mathcal{T}_h,\ \ v|_K \text{ is affine}\}\,,\\ P_1^{nc} &= \{v_h \in P_1^d\,;\ \forall\, \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int},\ v_h|_{K_\sigma}(\mathbf{x}_\sigma) = v_h|_{L_\sigma}(\mathbf{x}_\sigma)\,,\\ \mathbf{P}_1^c &= \{\mathbf{v}_h \in (P_1^d)^2\,;\ \mathbf{v}_h \text{ is continuous and } \mathbf{v}_h|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0}\}. \end{aligned}$$

We have $\mathbf{P}_1^c \subset \mathbf{H}_0^1$. We define the projection operator $\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_1^c} : \mathbf{H}_0^1 \to \mathbf{P}_1^c$. For all $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbf{H}_0^1$, $\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_1^c}\mathbf{v} = (v_h^1, v_h^2) \in \mathbf{P}_1^c$ is given by

$$\forall\, \boldsymbol{\phi}_h = (\phi_h^1, \phi_h^2) \in \mathbf{P}_1^c\,, \qquad \sum_{i=1}^{2} \big(\nabla v_h^i, \nabla \phi_h^i\big) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \big(\nabla v_i, \nabla \phi_h^i\big).$$

The operator $\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_1^c}$ is stable for the $\mathbf{H}^1$ norm and ([2] p. 110) there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^1$

$$|\mathbf{v} - \Pi_{\mathbf{P}_1^c}\mathbf{v}| \le C\, h\, \|\mathbf{v}\|_1. \tag{2.9}$$

Let us address now the space P_1^{nc}. If $q_h \in P_1^{nc}$, we have usually $\nabla q_h \notin \mathbb{L}^2$. Thus we define the operator $\widetilde{\nabla}_h : P_1^{nc} \to \mathbf{P}_0$ by setting for all $q_h \in P_1^{nc}$ and all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$

$$\widetilde{\nabla}_h q_h|_K = \frac{1}{|K|} \int_K \nabla q_h \, d\mathbf{x}.$$

The associated norm is given by

$$\|q_h\|_{1,h} = \Big(|q_h|^2 + |\widetilde{\nabla}_h q_h|^2\Big)^{1/2}.$$

We also have a Poincaré inequality: there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $q_h \in P_1^{nc} \cap L_0^2$

$$|q_h| \le C\, |\widetilde{\nabla}_h q_h|. \tag{2.10}$$

We define the projection operator $\Pi_{P_1^{nc}}$. For all $q_h \in P_1^{nc}$, $\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h$ is given by

$$\forall\, \phi \in L^2\,, \qquad (\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h, \phi) = (q_h, \phi). \tag{2.11}$$

We have the following result.

Proposition 2.2. *If* $q_h \in P_0$, $\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h$ *is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \forall\, \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}, \quad (\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h)(\mathbf{x}_\sigma) &= \frac{|K_\sigma|}{|K_\sigma| + |L_\sigma|}\, q_{K_\sigma} + \frac{|L_\sigma|}{|K_\sigma| + |L_\sigma|}\, q_{L_\sigma},\\ \forall\, \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{ext}, \quad (\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h)(\mathbf{x}_\sigma) &= q_{K_\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. For all edge $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h$, we define the function $\psi_\sigma \in P_1^{nc}$ by setting

$$\psi_\sigma(\mathbf{x}_{\sigma'}) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 1 \text{ if } \sigma = \sigma', \\ 0 \text{ otherwise.} \end{array} \right. .$$

Let us notice that ψ_σ vanishes outside $K_\sigma \cup L_\sigma$ if $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}$ and outside K_σ if $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{ext}$. Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}$. Using a quadrature formula we get

$$(\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h, \psi_\sigma) = \left(\frac{|K_\sigma|}{3} + \frac{|L_\sigma|}{3} \right) (\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h)(\mathbf{x}_\sigma)$$

and

$$(q_h, \psi_\sigma) = q_{K_\sigma} \frac{|K_\sigma|}{3} + q_{L_\sigma} \frac{|L_\sigma|}{3}.$$

For an edge $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{ext}$ we have $(\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h, \psi_\sigma) = \frac{|K_\sigma|}{3} (\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h)(\mathbf{x}_\sigma)$ and $(q_h, \psi_\sigma) = q_{K_\sigma} \frac{|K_\sigma|}{3}$. By plugging these equations into (2.11) with $\phi = \psi_\sigma$, we get the result. ∎

We finally introduce the Raviart-Thomas spaces

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{RT_0^d} &= \{ \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_1^d \, ; \quad \forall \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K, \quad \mathbf{v}_h|_K \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} \text{ is a constant, and } \mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \}, \\ \mathbf{RT_0} &= \{ \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{RT_0^d} \, ; \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h, \quad \forall \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K, \quad \mathbf{v}_h|_{K_\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K_\sigma,\sigma} = \mathbf{v}_h|_{L_\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K_\sigma,\sigma} \}. \end{aligned}$$

For all $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{RT_0}$, $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K$ we set $(\mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma = \mathbf{v}_h|_K \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}$. We define the operator $\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}} : \mathbf{H}^1 \to \mathbf{RT_0}$. For all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^1$, $\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}} \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{RT_0}$ is given by

$$\forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h, \qquad \forall \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K, \qquad (\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma = \frac{1}{|\sigma|} \int_\sigma \mathbf{v} \, d\sigma. \tag{2.12}$$

One checks [3] that there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^1$

$$|\mathbf{v} - \Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}} \mathbf{v}| \le C \, h \, \|\mathbf{v}\|_1. \tag{2.13}$$

The following result will be useful.

Proposition 2.3. *For all* $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^1$ *such that* $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} = 0$, *we have* $\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}} \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{P}_0$.

PROOF. Let $\mathbf{v}_h = \Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}} \mathbf{v}$ and $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$. According to [3] there exists $\mathbf{a}_K \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $b_K \in \mathbb{R}$ such that: $\forall \mathbf{x} \in K$, $\mathbf{v}_h(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{a}_K + b_K \, \mathbf{x}$. Thus $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_h|_K = 2 \, b_K$. On the other hand, according to the divergence formula and (2.12)

$$0 = \int_K \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\partial K} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, d\gamma = \int_{\partial K} \mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{n} \, d\gamma = \int_K \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_h \, d\mathbf{x}.$$

Hence $b_K = 0$ and we get: $\forall \mathbf{x} \in K$, $\mathbf{v}_h(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{a}_K$. ∎

2.3. The discrete operators.

The equations (1.1)–(1.2) use the differential operators gradient, divergence and laplacian. Using the spaces of section 2.2 we define their discrete counterparts. The discrete gradient $\nabla_h : P_0 \to \mathbf{P}_0$ is built using a linear interpolation on the edges of the mesh (see [16] for details). This kind of construction has also be considered in [5]. We set for all $q_h \in P_0$ and all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_h \, q_h|_K \;&=\; \frac{1}{|K|} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma| \left(\alpha_{K_\sigma, L_\sigma} \, q_{K_\sigma} + \alpha_{L_\sigma, K_\sigma} \, q_{L_\sigma} \right) \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} \\ &+\; \frac{1}{|K|} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{ext}} |\sigma| \, q_{K_\sigma} \, \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

We have the following result [16].

Proposition 2.4. *If* $q_h \in L_0^2$ *is such that* $\nabla_h q_h = 0$, *then* $q_h = 0$.

The discrete divergence operator $\mathrm{div}_h : \mathbf{P}_0 \to P_0$ is built so that it is adjoint to the operator ∇_h (proposition 4.6 below). We set for all $q_h \in P_0$ and all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$

$$\mathrm{div}_h\, \mathbf{v}_h|_K = \frac{1}{|K|} \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma| \left(\alpha_{L_\sigma,K_\sigma}\, \mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma} + \alpha_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma}\, \mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma}\right) \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}. \tag{2.15}$$

The first discrete laplacian $\Delta_h : P_0 \to P_0$ ensures that the incompressibility constraint (1.2) is satisfied in a discrete sense (proposition 3.1). We set for all $q_h \in P_0$

$$\Delta_h q_h = \mathrm{div}_h(\nabla_h q_h). \tag{2.16}$$

The second discrete laplacian $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h : \mathbf{P}_0 \to \mathbf{P}_0$ is the usual operator in finite volume schemes [6]. We set for all $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ and all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h \mathbf{v}_h|_K = \frac{1}{|K|} \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \tau_\sigma \left(\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}\right) - \frac{1}{|K|} \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{ext}} \tau_\sigma\, \mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}.$$

In order to approximate the convection term $(\mathbf{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla})\mathbf{u}$ in (1.1) we define a bilinear form $\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h : \mathbf{P}_0 \times \mathbf{P}_0 \to \mathbf{P}_0$ using the well-known upwind scheme ([6] p. 766). For all $\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$, $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$, and all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ we have

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h)\big|_K = \frac{1}{|K|} \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma| \Big((\mathbf{u}_\sigma \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})^+\, \mathbf{v}_K + (\mathbf{u}_\sigma \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})^-\, \mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} \Big). \tag{2.17}$$

We have set $\mathbf{u}_\sigma = \alpha_{L_\sigma,K_\sigma}\, \mathbf{u}_{K_\sigma} + \alpha_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma}\, \mathbf{u}_{L_\sigma}$ and $a^+ = \max(a,0)$, $a^- = \min(a,0)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Lastly, we define the trilinear form $\mathrm{b}_h : \mathbf{P}_0 \times \mathbf{P}_0 \times \mathbf{P}_0 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ as follows. For all $\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$, $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$, $\mathbf{w}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$, we set

$$\mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{w}_h) = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} |K|\, \mathbf{w}_K \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h)\big|_K. \tag{2.18}$$

3. The scheme

We have defined in section 2 the discretization in space. We now have to define a discretization in time, and treat the incompressibility constraint (1.2). We use a projection method to this end. This kind of method has been introduced by Chorin [4] and Temam [15]. The basic idea is the following. The time interval $[0,T]$ is split with a time step k: $[0,T] = \bigcup_{n=0}^{N} [t_n, t_{n+1}]$ with $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $t_n = n\,k$ for all $n \in \{0, \ldots, N\}$. For all $m \in \{2, \ldots, N\}$, we compute (see equation (3.2) below) a first velocity field $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m \simeq \mathbf{u}(t_m)$ using only equation (1.1). We use a second-order BDF scheme for the discretization in time. We then project $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m$ (see equation (3.4) below) over a subspace of $\mathbf{P}_0$. We get a a pressure field $p_h^m \simeq p(t_m)$ and a second velocity field $\mathbf{u}_h^m \simeq \mathbf{u}(t_m)$, which fulfills the incompressibilty constraint (1.2) in a discrete sense. The algorithm goes as follows.

First, for all $m \in \{0, \ldots, N\}$, we set $\mathbf{f}_h^m = \Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} \mathbf{f}(t_m)$. Since the operator $\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}$ is stable for the $\mathbf{L}^2$-norm we get

$$|\mathbf{f}_h^m| = |\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} \mathbf{f}(t_m)| \le |\mathbf{f}(t_m)| \le \|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbf{L}^2)}. \tag{3.1}$$

We start with the initial values

$$\mathbf{u}_h^0 \in \mathbf{P}_0 \cap \mathbf{RT_0}\,, \qquad \mathbf{u}_h^1 \in \mathbf{P}_0 \cap \mathbf{RT_0} \qquad p_h^1 \in P_0 \cap L_0^2.$$

For all $n \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, $(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}, p_h^{n+1}, \mathbf{u}_h^{n+1})$ is deduced from $(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^n, p_h^n, \mathbf{u}_h^n)$ as follows.

- $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1} \in \mathbf{P}_0$ is given by

$$\frac{3\,\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n + \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}}{2\,k} - \frac{1}{\mathrm{Re}}\,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1} + \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n - \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}) + \nabla_h p_h^n = \mathbf{f}_h^{n+1}\,, \tag{3.2}$$

- $p_h^{n+1} \in P_1^{nc} \cap L_0^2$ is the solution of

$$\Delta_h(p_h^{n+1} - p_h^n) = \frac{3}{2\,k}\,\mathrm{div}_h\,\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\,, \tag{3.3}$$

- $\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} \in \mathbf{P}_0$ is deduced by

$$\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1} - \frac{2\,k}{3}\,\nabla_h(p_h^{n+1} - p_h^n). \tag{3.4}$$

Existence and unicity of a solution to equation (3.2) is classical ([6] for example). Let us show that equation (3.3) has also a unique solution. Let $q_h \in P_0 \cap L_0^2$ such that $\Delta_h q_h = 0$. According to proposition 4.6 we have for all $q_h \in P_0$

$$-(\Delta_h q_h, q_h) = -\big(\mathrm{div}_h(\nabla_h q_h), q_h\big) = (\nabla_h q_h, \nabla_h q_h) = |\nabla_h q_h|^2.$$

Therefore we have $\nabla_h q_h = 0$. Using proposition 2.4 we get $q_h = 0$. We have thus proved the unicity of a solution for equation (3.3). It is also the case for the associated linear system. It implies that this linear system has indeed a solution. Hence it is also the case for equation (3.3). Let us now prove that for all $m \in \{0, \dots, N\}$, $\mathbf{u}_h^m$ fulfills (1.2) in a discrete sense.

Lemma 3.1. *If* $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{RT_0} \cap \mathbf{P}_0$ *then* $\mathrm{div}_h\,\mathbf{v}_h = 0$.

Proof. Let $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$. Since $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{RT_0}$, definition (2.15) reads

$$\mathrm{div}_h\,\mathbf{v}_h|_K = \frac{1}{|K|}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K} |\sigma|\,(\alpha_{L_\sigma,K} + \alpha_{K,L_\sigma})\,\mathbf{v}_K\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}.$$

Since $\alpha_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma} + \alpha_{L_\sigma,K_\sigma} = 1$ we conclude that

$$\mathrm{div}_h\,\mathbf{v}_h|_K = \frac{1}{|K|}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K} |\sigma|\,\mathbf{v}_K\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} = \mathbf{v}_K\cdot\left(\frac{1}{|K|}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K}|\sigma|\,\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}\right) = 0. \qquad \blacksquare$$

Proposition 3.1. *For all* $m \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ *we have* $\mathrm{div}_h\,\mathbf{u}_h^m = 0$.

Proof. For $m \in \{0,1\}$ we have $\mathbf{u}_h^0 \in \mathbf{P}_0 \cap \mathbf{RT_0}$ and $\mathbf{u}_h^1 \in \mathbf{P}_0 \cap \mathbf{RT_0}$. Applying the lemma above we get the result. If $m \in \{2, \dots, N\}$, we apply the operator div_h to (3.3) and compare with (3.4). ■

4. Properties of the discrete operators

We prove that the differential operators in (1.1)–(1.2) and the operators defined in section 2.3 share similar properties.

4.1. Properties of the discrete convective term.

We define $\widetilde{\mathbf{b}} : \mathbf{H}^1\times\mathbf{H}^1 \to \mathbf{L}^2$. For all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1$ and $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbf{H}^1$ we set

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) = \big(\mathrm{div}(v_1\,\mathbf{u}), \mathrm{div}(v_2\,\mathbf{u})\big). \tag{4.1}$$

We show that the operator $\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h$ is a consistent approximation of $\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}$.

Proposition 4.1. *There exists a constant* $C > 0$ *such that for all* $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^2$ *and all* $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^2 \cap \mathbf{H}_0^1$ *satisfying* $\mathrm{div}\,\mathbf{u} = 0$

$$\|\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) - \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}, \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{v})\|_{-1,h} \le C\,h\,\|\mathbf{u}\|_2\,\|\mathbf{v}\|_1.$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{u}_h = \Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}_h = \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{v}$. According to proposition 2.3 we have $\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$. Let $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$. According to the divergence formula and (2.7) we have

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})|_K = \frac{1}{|K|}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \int_\sigma \mathbf{v}\,(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})\,d\sigma.$$

On the other hand, let us rewrite $\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h,\mathbf{v}_h)$. Let $\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{int}$. Setting

$$\mathbf{v}_{K,L_\sigma}=\begin{cases}\mathbf{v}_K & \text{si } (\mathbf{u}_h\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma\geq 0\\ \mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} & \text{si } (\mathbf{u}_h\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma< 0\end{cases}$$

one checks that $\mathbf{v}_K\,(\mathbf{u}_\sigma\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})^+ + \mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma}\,(\mathbf{u}_\sigma\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})^- = \mathbf{v}_{K,L_\sigma}\,(\mathbf{u}_\sigma\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})$. By definition $\mathbf{u}_\sigma\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}=\alpha_{L_\sigma,K}\,(\mathbf{u}_K\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})+\alpha_{K,L_\sigma}\,(\mathbf{u}_{L_\sigma}\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})$; since $\mathbf{u}_h\in\mathbf{RT_0}$ we get $\mathbf{u}_\sigma\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}=(\alpha_{L_\sigma,K}+\alpha_{K,L_\sigma})\,(\mathbf{u}_K\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})=(\mathbf{u}_K\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})=(\mathbf{u}_h\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma$. Using at last (2.12), we deduce from (2.17)

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h,\mathbf{v}_h)|_K=\frac{1}{|K|}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{int}}\int_\sigma \mathbf{v}_{K,L_\sigma}\,(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})\,d\sigma.$$

Thus

$$\left(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})-\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h,\mathbf{v}_h)\right)|_K=\frac{1}{|K|}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{int}}\int_\sigma(\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{v}_{K,L_\sigma})\,(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})\,d\sigma.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\psi}_h\in\mathbf{P}_0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})-\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h,\mathbf{v}_h),\boldsymbol{\psi}_h\right) &= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\boldsymbol{\psi}_K\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{int}}\int_\sigma(\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{v}_{K,L_\sigma})\,(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})\,d\sigma\\ &= \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{int}}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_{K_\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\psi}_{L_\sigma})\int_\sigma(\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma})\,(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})\,d\sigma. \qquad (4.2)\end{aligned}$$

Let $\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{int}$. We want to estimate the integral over σ. Since we work in a two-dimensional domain, we have the Sobolev injection $\mathbf{H}^2\subset\mathbb{L}^\infty$. Thus

$$\left|\int_\sigma(\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma})\,(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})\,d\sigma\right|\leq\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}\int_\sigma|\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma}|\,d\sigma\leq C\,\|\mathbf{u}\|_2\int_\sigma|\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma}|\,d\sigma.$$

Let us first assume that $\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{C}^1$. We set

$$\mathbf{x}_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma}=\begin{cases}\mathbf{x}_{K_\sigma} & \text{si } (\mathbf{u}_h\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma\geq 0\\ \mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma} & \text{si } (\mathbf{u}_h\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma< 0\end{cases}.$$

If $\mathbf{x}\in\sigma$, we have the following Taylor expansion

$$\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x})-\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma}=\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x})-\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma})=\int_0^1\boldsymbol{\nabla}\mathbf{v}\,(t\,\mathbf{x}+(1-t)\,\mathbf{x}_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma})\,(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma})\,dt.$$

We have $|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma}|\leq h$. Thus, integrating over σ and using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$\int_\sigma|\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma}|\,d\sigma\leq\sqrt{2}\left(\int_\sigma\int_0^1|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\mathbf{v}\,(t\,\mathbf{x}+(1-t)\,\mathbf{x}_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma})|^2\,h\,\sqrt{t}\,dt\,d\sigma\right)^{1/2}.$$

We then use the change of variable $(t,\mathbf{x})\to\mathbf{y}=t\,\mathbf{x}+(1-t)\,\mathbf{x}_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma}$. Let D_σ be the quadrilateral domain given by the endpoints of σ, $\mathbf{x}_{K_\sigma}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma}$. The domain $[0,1]\times\sigma$ becomes D_{K_σ,L_σ} with

$$D_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma}=\begin{cases}D_\sigma\cap K_\sigma & \text{si } (\mathbf{u}_h\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma\geq 0\\ D_\sigma\cap L_\sigma & \text{si } (\mathbf{u}_h\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma< 0\end{cases}.$$

For all $t\in[0,1]$ we have $h\sqrt{t}\leq h\,t\leq C\,d(\mathbf{x}_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma},\sigma)\,t$ thanks to the hypothesis on the mesh. We check easily that $d(\mathbf{x}_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma},\sigma)\,t\,dt\,d\sigma=d\mathbf{y}$. Thus we get

$$\int_\sigma|\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma}|\,d\sigma\leq C\,h\left(\int_{D_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma}}|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\mathbf{v}\,(\mathbf{y})|^2\,d\mathbf{y}\right)^{1/2}.$$

Since $(\mathcal{C}^1)^2$ is dense in $\mathbf{H}^2$, this estimate still holds for $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^2$. Plugging this estimate into (4.2) and using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\left(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) - \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}, \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{v}), \boldsymbol{\psi}_h\right)\right| \\ &\leq C\, h\, \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{H}^2} \left(\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\boldsymbol{\psi}_{L_\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\psi}_{K_\sigma}|^2\right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \int_{D_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma}} |\boldsymbol{\nabla}\mathbf{v}\,(\mathbf{y})|^2\, d\mathbf{y}\right)^{1/2}\end{aligned}$$

so that $\left|\left(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) - \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}, \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{v}), \boldsymbol{\psi}_h\right)\right| \leq C\, h\, \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{H}^2}\, \|\boldsymbol{\psi}_h\|_{1,h}\, \|\mathbf{v}\|_1$. Using then definition (2.6), we get the result. ■

Let us consider now the operator b_h. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{L}^\infty \cap \mathbf{H}^1$ with $\operatorname{div}\mathbf{u} \geq 0$. Integrating by parts we deduce from (4.1): $\int_\Omega \mathbf{v}\cdot\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\, d\mathbf{x} = \int_\Omega \frac{|\mathbf{v}|^2}{2} \operatorname{div}\mathbf{u}\, d\mathbf{x} \geq 0$. The discrete operator b_h shares a similar property.

Proposition 4.2. *Let* $\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ *such that* $\operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{u}_h \geq 0$. *For all* $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ *we have*

$$\mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) \geq 0.$$

Proof. Remember that for all edges $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}$, two triangles K_σ et L_σ share σ as an edge. We denote by K_σ the one such that $\mathbf{u}_\sigma \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K_\sigma,\sigma} \geq 0$. Using the algebraic identity $2\,a\,(a-b) = a^2 - b^2 + (a-b)^2$ we deduce from (2.18)

$$\begin{aligned} 2\,\mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h,\mathbf{v}_h,\mathbf{v}_h) &= 2\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma|\, \mathbf{v}_{K\sigma}\cdot(\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma})\,(\mathbf{u}_\sigma\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K_\sigma,\sigma}) \\ &= \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma| \left(|\mathbf{v}_{K\sigma}|^2 - |\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma}|^2 + |\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma}|^2\right)(\mathbf{u}_\sigma\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K_\sigma,\sigma}) \end{aligned}$$

so that $2\,\mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h,\mathbf{v}_h,\mathbf{v}_h) \geq \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma| \left(|\mathbf{v}_{K\sigma}|^2 - |\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma}|^2\right)(\mathbf{u}_\sigma\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K_\sigma,\sigma})$. This sum can be written as a sum over the triangles of the mesh. We get

$$2\,\mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h,\mathbf{v}_h,\mathbf{v}_h) \geq \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} |\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}|^2 \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma|\,(\mathbf{u}_\sigma\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K_\sigma,\sigma}).$$

Using finally definition (2.15) we get

$$2\,\mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h,\mathbf{v}_h,\mathbf{v}_h) \geq \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} |K|\,|\mathbf{v}_K|^2\,(\operatorname{div}_h\mathbf{u}_h)|_K \geq 0. \qquad ■$$

The following result states that the operator b_h is stable for suitable norms.

Proposition 4.3. *There exists a constant* $C > 0$ *such that for all* $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$, $\mathbf{w}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$, $\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ *satisfying* $\operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{u}_h = 0$

$$|\mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h,\mathbf{v}_h,\mathbf{v}_h)| \leq C\,|\mathbf{u}_h|\,\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h\,\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h.$$

Proof. For all triangle $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and all edge $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}$, we have

$$(\mathbf{u}_\sigma\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})^+\,\mathbf{v}_K + (\mathbf{u}_\sigma\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})^-\,\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} = (\mathbf{u}_\sigma\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})\,\mathbf{v}_K - |(\mathbf{u}_\sigma\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})|\,(\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_K).$$

This way, we deduce from (4.7) $\mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h,\mathbf{v}_h,\mathbf{w}_h) = S_1 + S_2$ with

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \mathbf{v}_K\cdot\mathbf{w}_K \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma|\,(\mathbf{u}_\sigma\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})\,, \\ S_2 &= -\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \mathbf{w}_K\cdot \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma|\,|\mathbf{u}_\sigma\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}|\,(\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_K). \end{aligned}$$

By writing the sum over the edges as a sum over the triangles we get

$$S_2 = -\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma|\,|\mathbf{u}_\sigma\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}|\,(\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma}-\mathbf{v}_K)\cdot(\mathbf{w}_{L_\sigma}-\mathbf{w}_K).$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we get

$$|S_2| \le h\,\|\mathbf{u}_h\|_\infty \left(\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma}-\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}|^2\right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\mathbf{w}_{L_\sigma}-\mathbf{w}_{K_\sigma}|^2\right)^{1/2}.$$

Since $\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ we have the inverse inequality [6] $h\,\|\mathbf{u}_h\|_\infty \le C\,|\mathbf{u}_h|$. Using (2.2) and (2.4) we have

$$\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma}-\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}|^2 \le C \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \tau_\sigma\,|\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma}-\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}|^2 \le C\,\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h^2$$

and $\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\mathbf{w}_{L_\sigma}-\mathbf{w}_{K_\sigma}|^2 \le C\,\|\mathbf{w}_h\|_h^2$. Therefore $|S_2| \le C\,|\mathbf{u}_h|\,\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h\,\|\mathbf{w}_h\|_h$. On the other hand we deduce from definition (2.15)

$$S_1 = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} |K|\,(\mathbf{v}_K\cdot\mathbf{w}_K)\,(\mathrm{div}_h\,\mathbf{u}_h)|_K = 0.$$

By combining the estimates for S_1 and S_2 we get the result. ■

4.2. Properties of the discrete gradient.

Proposition 4.4. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $q_h \in P_0$: $h\,|\nabla_h q_h| \le C\,|q_h|$.*

Proof. Using (2.14) and the Minkowski inequality, we have for all triangle $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$

$$|K|\,|\nabla_h q_h\,|_K|^2 \le \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \frac{6\,|\sigma|^2}{|K|}\,(q_K^2+q_{L_\sigma}^2) + \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{ext}} \frac{6\,|\sigma|^2}{|K|}\,q_K^2.$$

Let us sum over $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$. Since $|\sigma| \le h$, using (2.3), we get

$$|\nabla_h q_h|^2 \le \frac{C}{h^2}\left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \left(|K|\,q_K^2 + |L_\sigma|\,q_{L_\sigma}^2\right) + \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{ext}} |K|\,q_K^2\right).$$

Thus $h^2\,|\nabla_h q_h|^2 \le C\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} |K|\,q_K^2 \le C\,|q_h|^2$. ■

We now prove that ∇_h is a consistent approximation of the gradient.

Proposition 4.5. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $q \in H^2$*

$$|\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}(\nabla q) - \nabla_h(\widetilde{\Pi}_{P_0} q)| \le C\,h\,\|q\|_2.$$

Proof. Let $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$. Using the gradient formula and definition (2.14) we get

$$|K|\,\Big(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}(\nabla q) - \nabla_h(\widetilde{\Pi}_{P_0} q)\Big)\Big|_K = \int_K \nabla q\,d\mathbf{x} - |K|\,\nabla_h(\widetilde{\Pi}_{P_0} q)\Big|_K = \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K} I_K^\sigma$$

where we have set for all edge $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}$

$$I_K^\sigma = \int_\sigma \Big(q - \big(\alpha_{K,L_\sigma}\,q(\mathbf{x}_K) + \alpha_{L_\sigma,K}\,q(\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma})\big)\Big)\,\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}\,d\sigma$$

and for all edge $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{ext}$: $I_K^\sigma = \int_\sigma \big(q - q(\mathbf{x}_K)\big)\, \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}\, d\sigma$. Squaring and using (2.3) we get

$$|K| \left| \Big(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}(\nabla q) - \nabla_h(\widetilde{\Pi}_{P_0} q)\Big)\Big|_K \right|^2 \leq \frac{3}{|K|} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K} |I_K^\sigma|^2 \leq \frac{C}{h^2} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K} |I_K^\sigma|^2.$$

Summing over the triangles $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ we get

$$\Big|\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}(\nabla q) - \nabla_h(\widetilde{\Pi}_{P_0} q)\Big|^2 \leq \frac{C}{h^2} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K} |I_K^\sigma|^2. \tag{4.3}$$

We must estimate the integral terms I_K^σ. Let $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$. Let us first assume that $q \in \mathcal{C}^2(\overline{\Omega})$. Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}$. For $\mathbf{x} \in \sigma$ we have the following Taylor expansions

$$q(\mathbf{x}_K) = q(\mathbf{x}) + \nabla q(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x}) + \int_0^1 \mathbf{H}(q)\,(t\mathbf{x}_K + (1-t)\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x})\, t\, dt\,,$$

$$q(\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma}) = q(\mathbf{x}) + \nabla q(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{x}) + \int_0^1 \mathbf{H}(q)\,(t\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma} + (1-t)\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{x})\, t\, dt\,,$$

$$\nabla q(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla q(\mathbf{x}_K) - \int_0^1 \boldsymbol{\nabla} \nabla q\,\big(t\mathbf{x}_K + (1-t)\mathbf{x}\big)(\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x})\, dt.$$

Plugging the last expansion into the two others and integrating over σ we get

$$\int_\sigma \big(q(\mathbf{x}_K) - q\big)\, d\sigma = |\sigma|\, \nabla q(\mathbf{x}_K) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x}_\sigma) - A_K^\sigma + B_K^\sigma\,, \tag{4.4}$$

$$\int_\sigma \big(q(\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma}) - q\big)\, d\sigma = |\sigma|\, \nabla q(\mathbf{x}_K) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{x}_\sigma) - A_{L_\sigma}^\sigma + B_{L_\sigma}^\sigma. \tag{4.5}$$

We have set for $T \in \{K_\sigma, L_\sigma\}$

$$A_T^\sigma = \int_\sigma \int_0^1 \boldsymbol{\nabla} \nabla q\,(t\mathbf{x}_T + (1-t)\mathbf{x})\,(\mathbf{x}_T - \mathbf{x})\, dt\, d\sigma\,, \tag{4.6}$$

$$B_T^\sigma = \int_\sigma \int_0^1 \mathbf{H}(q)\,(t\mathbf{x}_T + (1-t)\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x}_T - \mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_T - \mathbf{x})\, t\, dt\, d\sigma. \tag{4.7}$$

One can bound these terms as in the proof of proposition 4.1. We get

$$|A_T^\sigma|^2 \leq C\, h^2 \int_{D_\sigma} |\boldsymbol{\nabla} \nabla q\,(\mathbf{y})|^2\, d\mathbf{y}\,, \qquad |B_T^\sigma|^2 \leq C\, h^4 \int_{D_\sigma} |\mathbf{H}(q)(\mathbf{y})|^2\, d\mathbf{y}. \tag{4.8}$$

Now, let us multiply (4.4) by $-\alpha_{K,L_\sigma}\, \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}$, (4.5) by $-\alpha_{L_\sigma,K}\, \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}$ and sum the equalities. Since $\alpha_{L_\sigma,K} + \alpha_{K,L_\sigma} = 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\alpha_{L_\sigma,K} \int_\sigma \big(q(\mathbf{x}_K) - q\big)\, \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}\, d\sigma - \alpha_{K,L_\sigma} \int_\sigma \big(q(\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma}) - q\big)\, \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}\, d\sigma \\ = \int_\sigma \Big(q - \big(\alpha_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma}\, q(\mathbf{x}_{K,\sigma}) + \alpha_{L_\sigma,K_\sigma}\, q(\mathbf{x}_{L,\sigma})\big)\Big)\, \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}\, d\sigma = I_K^\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand

$$-\alpha_{K,L_\sigma}\,(\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x}_\sigma) \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} - \alpha_{L_\sigma,K}\,(\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{x}_\sigma) \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} = -\alpha_{K,L_\sigma}\, \alpha_{L_\sigma,K}\,(d_\sigma - d_\sigma) = 0.$$

Therefore we get $I_K^\sigma = -\alpha_{L_\sigma,K}\, \big(A_K^\sigma + B_K^\sigma\big)\, \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} - \alpha_{K,L_\sigma}\, \big(A_{L_\sigma}^\sigma + B_{L_\sigma}^\sigma\big)\, \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}$. Using estimates (4.8) we obtain

$$|I_K^\sigma|^2 \leq C\, h^4 \int_{D_\sigma} (|\mathbf{H}(q)(\mathbf{y})|^2 + |\boldsymbol{\nabla} \nabla q(\mathbf{y})|^2)\, d\mathbf{y}.$$

We now consider the case $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{ext}$. For $\mathbf{x} \in \sigma$ we have

$$q(\mathbf{x}_K) = q(\mathbf{x}) + \nabla q(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x}) + \int_0^1 \mathbf{H}(q)(t\mathbf{x}_K + (1-t)\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x}) t dt.$$

Multiplying by $\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}$ and integrating over σ, we get $-I_K^\sigma = J_K^\sigma \, \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} + B_K^\sigma \, \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}$ with $J_K^\sigma = \int_\sigma \nabla q(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}$. Since $|\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x}| \le h$ if $\mathbf{x} \in \sigma$, using a trace theorem, we have

$$|J_K^\sigma| \le C\, h^2 \, \|\nabla q\|_{\mathbf{L}^\infty(\sigma)} \le C\, h^2 \left(\int_{D_\sigma} \left(|\nabla q(\mathbf{y})|^2 + |\boldsymbol{\nabla} \nabla q(\mathbf{y})|^2 \right) d\mathbf{y} \right)^{1/2}.$$

By combining this estimate with (4.8), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |I_K^\sigma|^2 \le 2\, |J^\sigma|^2 + 2\, |B_K^\sigma|^2 \quad & \le \quad C\, h^4 \int_{D_\sigma} |\mathbf{H}(q)(\mathbf{y})|^2 \, d\mathbf{y} \\ & + \quad C\, h^4 \int_{D_\sigma} (|\nabla q(\mathbf{y})|^2 + |\boldsymbol{\nabla} \nabla q(\mathbf{y})|^2) \, d\mathbf{y}. \end{aligned}$$

The space $\mathcal{C}^2(\overline{\Omega})$ is dense in H^2. Therefore the bounds for I_K^σ still hold for $q \in H^2$. Plugging these bounds into (4.3) we get the result. ■

4.3. Properties of the discrete divergence. The operators divergence and gradient are adjoint: if $q \in H^1$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^1$ with $\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$, we get $(\mathbf{v}, \nabla q) = -(q, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v})$ by integrating by parts. For ∇_h and div_h we state

Proposition 4.6. *If* $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ *and* $q_h \in P_0$ *we have:* $(\mathbf{v}_h, \nabla_h q_h) = -(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v}_h)$.

Proof. Using (2.14) one checks that $(\mathbf{v}_h, \nabla_h q_h) = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} q_K \, (S_1 + S_2 + S_3)$ with

$$S_1 = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma| \, \alpha_{K,L_\sigma} \, \mathbf{v}_K \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}\,, \qquad S_2 = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma| \, \alpha_{K,L_\sigma} \, \mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{L_\sigma,\sigma}\,,$$

and $S_3 = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma| \, \mathbf{v}_K \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}$. Since $\alpha_{K,L_\sigma} + \alpha_{L_\sigma,K} = 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma| \, (1 - \alpha_{L_\sigma,K}) \, \mathbf{v}_K \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma| \, \mathbf{v}_K \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} - \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma| \, \alpha_{L_\sigma,K} \, \mathbf{v}_K \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{n}_{L_\sigma,\sigma} = -\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}$, we also have

$$S_2 = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma| \, \alpha_{K,L_\sigma} \, \mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{L_\sigma,\sigma} = - \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma| \, \alpha_{K,L_\sigma} \, \mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}.$$

Therefore

$$(\mathbf{v}_h, \nabla_h q_h) = - \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma| \, (\alpha_{L,K_\sigma} \, \mathbf{v}_K + \alpha_{K,L_\sigma} \, \mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma}) \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,L_\sigma} + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K} |\sigma| \, \mathbf{v}_K \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,L_\sigma}.$$

Using definition (2.15) we get

$$(\mathbf{v}_h, \nabla_h q_h) = - \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} |K| \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v}_h|_K + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K} |\sigma| \, \mathbf{v}_K \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,L_\sigma}.$$

Since $\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K} |\sigma| \, \mathbf{v}_K \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,L_\sigma} = \mathbf{v}_K \cdot \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K} |\sigma| \, \mathbf{n}_{K,L_\sigma} = 0$ we obtain finally

$$(\mathbf{v}_h, \nabla_h q_h) = - \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} q_K \, |K| \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v}_h|_K = -(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v}_h).$$ ■

The divergence operator and the spaces L^2_0, $\mathbf{H}^1_0$ satisfy the following property, called inf-sup (or Babuška-Brezzi) condition (see [10] for example). There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{q \in L^2_0 \setminus \{0\}} \quad \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^1_0 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} -\frac{(q, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v})}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_1 |q|} \geq C. \tag{4.9}$$

We will now prove that the operator div_h and the spaces $P_0 \cap L^2_0$, $\mathbf{P}_0$ satisfy an analogous property. The proof is based on the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *We assume that the mesh is uniform (i.e. the triangles of the mesh are equilateral). Then we have for all* $q_h \in P_0$

$$\nabla_h q_h = \widetilde{\nabla}_h(\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h).$$

Proof. Since the mesh is uniform we have: $\forall\, \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}$, $\alpha_{K_\sigma, L_\sigma} = \frac{1}{2}$. Let $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$. Using definition (2.14) and the gradient formula we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_K \left(\nabla_h q_h - \widetilde{\nabla}_h(\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h)\right) d\mathbf{x} &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \frac{|\sigma|}{2} \left(q_{K_\sigma} + q_{L_\sigma}\right) \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} \\ &+ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{ext}} |\sigma|\, q_{K_\sigma}\, \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} - \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K} \int_\sigma (\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h)\, \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}\, d\sigma.\end{aligned}$$

Since $q_h \in P_0$ we deduce from proposition 2.2

$$\int_\sigma \Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h \, d\sigma = |\sigma| \, (\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h)(\mathbf{x}_\sigma) = \begin{cases} \frac{|\sigma|}{2} \left(q_{K_\sigma} + q_{L_\sigma}\right) & \text{if } \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}, \\ |\sigma|\, q_{K_\sigma} & \text{if } \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{ext}. \end{cases}$$

Plugging this into the equation above, we get $\nabla_h q_h|_K = \widetilde{\nabla}_h(\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h)|_K$. ■

Lemma 4.2. *We assume that the mesh is uniform. There exists a constant* $C > 0$ *such that*

$$\forall\, q_h \in P_0 \cap L^2_0, \qquad \sup_{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} -\frac{(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v}_h)}{\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h} \geq C\, h\, \|\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h\|_{1,h}.$$

Proof. If $q_h = 0$ the result is trivial. Let $q_h \in P_0 \cap L^2_0 \setminus \{0\}$. Let $\mathbf{v}_h = \nabla_h q_h \in \mathbf{P}_0 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$. Using proposition 4.6 we have

$$-(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v}_h) = (\mathbf{v}_h, \nabla_h q_h) = |\nabla_h q_h|^2 = |\nabla_h q_h|\, |\mathbf{v}_h|.$$

Let χ_Ω be the characteristic function of Ω. Putting $\psi = \chi_\Omega$ in (2.11) we get $\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h \in L^2_0$. So according to (2.10) and(4.1) we have

$$|\nabla_h q_h| = \left|\widetilde{\nabla}_h(\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h)\right| \geq C\, \|\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h\|_{1,h}.$$

On the other hand, according to proposition 2.1: $|\mathbf{v}_h| \geq C\, h\, \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h$. Therefore

$$-(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v}_h) \geq C\, h\, \|\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h\|_{1,h}\, \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h. \qquad ■$$

Proposition 4.7. *We assume that the mesh is uniform. There exists a constant* $C > 0$ *such that for all* $q_h \in P_0 \cap L^2_0$

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} -\frac{(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v}_h)}{\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h} \geq C\, |\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h|.$$

PROOF. If $q_h = 0$ the result is clear. Let $q_h \in P_0 \cap L^2_0 \backslash \{0\}$. According to (4.9) there exists $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^1_0$ such that

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} = -\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{v}\|_1 \leq C\, |\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h|. \tag{4.10}$$

We set $\mathbf{v}_h = \Pi_{\mathbf{P}_1^c} \mathbf{v}$. We want to estimate $-\big(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} \mathbf{v}_h)\big)$. Since $\nabla_h q_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ we deduce from proposition 4.6

$$-\big(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} \mathbf{v}_h)\big) = (\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} \mathbf{v}_h, \nabla_h q_h) = (\mathbf{v}_h, \nabla_h q_h).$$

Splitting the last term we get

$$-\big(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} \mathbf{v}_h)\big) = (\mathbf{v}, \nabla_h q_h) - (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_h, \nabla_h q_h). \tag{4.11}$$

One one hand, integrating by parts, we get

$$(\mathbf{v}, \nabla_h q_h) = -(\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}) + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K} \int_\sigma (\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h)\, (\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})\, d\sigma.$$

According to (4.10) we have $-(\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}) = |\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h|^2$. Moreover

$$\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K} \int_\sigma (\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h)\, (\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})\, d\sigma = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \int_\sigma (\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h)\, (\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K_\sigma,\sigma})\, d\sigma$$

since $\mathbf{v}|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0}$. Using [2] p.269 and (4.10) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \int_\sigma (\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h)\, (\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})\, d\sigma \right| &\leq C\, h\, \|\mathbf{v}\|_1\, \|\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h\|_{1,h} \\ &\leq C\, h\, |\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h|\, \|\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h\|_{1,h}. \end{aligned}$$

So we get

$$(\mathbf{v}, \nabla_h q_h) \geq (|\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h| - C\, h\, \|\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h\|_{1,h})\, |\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h|. \tag{4.12}$$

On the other hand, using lemma 4.1 and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$|(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_h, \nabla_h q_h)| = |(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_h, \widetilde{\nabla}_h(\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h))| \leq |\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_h|\, |\widetilde{\nabla}_h(\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h)|.$$

Using (2.9) and (4.10) we get

$$|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_h| = |\mathbf{v} - \Pi_{\mathbf{P}_1^c} \mathbf{v}| \leq C\, h\, \|\mathbf{v}\|_1 \leq C\, h\, |\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h|.$$

Thus

$$|(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_h, \nabla_h q_h)| \leq C\, h\, |\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h|\, |\widetilde{\nabla}_h(\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h)| \leq C\, h\, |\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h|\, \|\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h\|_{1,h}.$$

Let us plug this estimate and (4.12) into (4.11). We get

$$-\big(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} \mathbf{v}_h)\big) \geq (|\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h| - C\, h\, \|\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h\|_{1,h})\, |\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h|.$$

We now introduce the norm $\|.\|_h$. We have $\mathbf{v}_h = \Pi_{\mathbf{P}_1^c} \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{P}_1^c \subset \mathbf{H}^1$. Thus, using [6] p. 776, we get $\|\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} \mathbf{v}_h\|_h \leq C\, \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_1$. Since $\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_1^c}$ is stable for the $\mathbf{H}^1$ norm, we deduce from (4.10)

$$\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_1 = \|\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_1^c} \mathbf{v}\|_1 \leq \|\mathbf{v}\|_1 \leq C\, |\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h|.$$

Therefore $\|\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} \mathbf{v}_h\|_h \leq C\, |\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h|$. Using this inequality in (4.3) we obtain that there exists constants $C_1 > 0$ and $C_2 > 0$ such that

$$-\big(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} \mathbf{v}_h)\big) \geq \big(C_1\, |\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h| - C_2\, h\, \|\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h\|_{1,h}\big)\, \|\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} \mathbf{v}_h\|_h.$$

We deduce from this

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0 \backslash \{\mathbf{0}\}} -\frac{(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v}_h)}{\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h} \geq C_1\, |\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h| - C_2\, h\, \|\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h\|_{1,h}.$$

Let us combine this with lemma 4.2. Since

$$\forall\, t \geq 0\,, \qquad \max\big(C\, t\,,\, C_1\, |\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h| - C_2\, t\big) \geq \frac{C\, C_1}{C + C_2}\, |\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q_h|$$

we get the result. ■

4.4. Properties of the discrete laplacian.

We first prove the coercivity of the discrete laplacian.

Proposition 4.8. *For all* $\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ *and* $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ *we have*

$$-(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{u}_h) = \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_h^2 \qquad -(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) \leq \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_h\, \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h.$$

Proof. Using definition (2.3) and writing the sum over the triangles as a sum over the edges, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) &= -\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \mathbf{v}_K \cdot \Big(\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \tau_\sigma\, (\mathbf{u}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{u}_K) - \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{ext}} \tau_\sigma\, \mathbf{u}_K\Big) \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \tau_\sigma\, (\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_K) \cdot (\mathbf{u}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{u}_K) + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{ext}} \tau_\sigma\, \mathbf{u}_K \cdot \mathbf{v}_K. \end{aligned}$$

We get the first half of the result by taking $\mathbf{v}_h = \mathbf{u}_h$. On the other hand, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the algebraic identity $a\,b + c\,d \leq \sqrt{a^2 + c^2}\sqrt{b^2 + d^2}$, we get the second half. ■

If $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^2$, we have $|\Delta \mathbf{v}| \leq \|\mathbf{v}\|_2$. The operator $\boldsymbol{\Delta}_h$ shares a similar property.

Proposition 4.9. *There exists a constant* $C > 0$ *such that for all* $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^2$

$$\Big|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h(\widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0} \mathbf{v})\Big| \leq C\, \|\mathbf{v}\|_2.$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{v}_h = \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0} \mathbf{v}$. Let $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$. According to definition (2.16)

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h \mathbf{v}_h|_K = \frac{1}{|K|} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \tau_\sigma\, (\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma}) - \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}_K)) - \frac{1}{|K|} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{ext}} \tau_\sigma\, \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}_K). \tag{4.13}$$

Let us first assume that $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2) \in (\mathcal{C}_0^\infty)^2$. Let $i \in \{1, 2\}$. If $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \sigma$ we have the Taylor expansions

$$v_i(\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma}) = v_i(\mathbf{x}) + \nabla v_i(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{x}) + \int_0^1 \mathbf{H}(v_i)(t\, \mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma} + (1-t)\, \mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{x})\, t\, dt\,,$$

$$v_i(\mathbf{x}_K) = v_i(\mathbf{x}) + \nabla v_i(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x}) + \int_0^1 \mathbf{H}(v_i)(t\, \mathbf{x}_K + (1-t)\, \mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x})\, t\, dt\,,$$

$$\nabla v_i(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla v_i(\mathbf{x}_K) - \int_0^1 \boldsymbol{\nabla} \nabla v_i(t\, \mathbf{x}_K + (1-t)\, \mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x})\, dt.$$

The notation $\mathbf{H}(v_i)$ refers to the hessian matrix of v_i. Plugging the last expansion into the two others and integrating over σ, we get

$$\int_\sigma \big(v_i(\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma}) - v_i(\mathbf{x})\big)\, d\mathbf{x} = \nabla v_i(\mathbf{x}_K) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{x}_\sigma) - A_{L_\sigma}^{\sigma,i} + B_{L_\sigma}^{\sigma,i}\,,$$

$$\int_\sigma \big(v_i(\mathbf{x}_K) - v_i(\mathbf{x})\big)\, d\mathbf{x} = \nabla v_i(\mathbf{x}_K) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x}_\sigma) - A_K^{\sigma,i} + B_K^{\sigma,i}.$$

The terms $A_T^{\sigma,i}$ and $B_T^{\sigma,i}$ are the same as in (4.6) and (4.7), with v_i instead of q. We substract these equations. Since $\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{x}_K = d_\sigma\, \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}$ we infer from (2.1)

$$\tau_\sigma\, \big(v_i(\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma}) - v_i(\mathbf{x}_K)\big) = \nabla v_i(\mathbf{x}_K) \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} + \frac{1}{d_\sigma}\, \Big(-A_{L_\sigma}^{\sigma,i} + B_{L_\sigma}^{\sigma,i} + A_K^{\sigma,i} - B_K^{\sigma,i}\Big).$$

Let us consider now the case $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{ext}$. If $\mathbf{x} \in \sigma$ we have the Taylor expansions

$$v_i(\mathbf{x}_K) = v_i(\mathbf{x}) + \nabla v_i(\mathbf{x})\cdot(\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x}) + \int_0^1 \mathbf{H}(v_i)(t\,\mathbf{x}_K + (1-t)\,\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x})\cdot(\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x})\,t\,dt\,,$$

$$\nabla v_i(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla v_i(\mathbf{x}_K) - \int_0^1 \boldsymbol{\nabla}\nabla v_i(t\,\mathbf{x}_K + (1-t)\,\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x})\,dt.$$

Since $v_i \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty$ we have $v_i(\mathbf{x}) = 0$. We plug the last expansion into the other and integrate over σ. Since $\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x}_\sigma = -d_\sigma\,\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}$ we deduce from (2.1)

$$-\tau_\sigma\, v_i(\mathbf{x}_K) = \nabla v_i(\mathbf{x}_K)\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} + \frac{1}{d_\sigma}\left(A_K^{\sigma,i} - B_K^{\sigma,i}\right).$$

Thus we get

$$\frac{1}{|K|}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \tau_\sigma\left(v_i(\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma}) - v_i(\mathbf{x}_K)\right) - \frac{1}{|K|}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{ext}} \tau_\sigma\, v_i(\mathbf{x}_K)$$
$$= \frac{1}{|K|}\nabla v_i(\mathbf{x}_K)\cdot\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K}|\sigma|\,\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} + \frac{1}{|K|}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K} R_\sigma^i$$

where we have set for all edge $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}$

$$R_\sigma^i = \frac{1}{d_\sigma}\left(-A_{L_\sigma}^{\sigma,i} + B_{L_\sigma}^{\sigma,i} + A_K^{\sigma,i} - B_K^{\sigma,i}\right)$$

and for all edge $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{ext}$: $R_\sigma^i = \frac{1}{d_\sigma}\left(A_K^{\sigma,i} - B_K^{\sigma,i}\right)$. Since $\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K}|\sigma|\,\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} = \mathbf{0}$, setting $\mathbf{R}_\sigma = (R_\sigma^1, R_\sigma^2)$, we get

$$\frac{1}{|K|}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \tau_\sigma\left(\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma}) - \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}_K)\right) - \frac{1}{|K|}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{ext}} \tau_\sigma\,\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}_K) = \frac{1}{|K|}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K}\mathbf{R}_\sigma.$$

Since the space $(\mathcal{C}_0^\infty)^2$ is dense in $\mathbf{H}^2$, one checks that this equation still holds for $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^2$. Using (4.13) we infer from it

$$\left|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\mathbf{v}_h\right|^2 = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}|K|\left|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\mathbf{v}_h|_K\right|^2 \le \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\frac{3}{|K|}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K}|\mathbf{R}_\sigma|^2.$$

Using estimates (4.6) and (4.7) we obtain

$$\left|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\mathbf{v}_h\right|^2 \le C\sum_{i=1}^2\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h}\int_{D_\sigma}\left(|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\nabla v_i|^2 + |\mathbf{H}(v_i)|^2\right)d\mathbf{x} \le C\,\|\mathbf{v}\|_2^2. \qquad \blacksquare$$

5. Stability of the scheme

We now use the results of section 4 to prove the stability of the scheme. We first show an estimate for the computed velocity (theorem 5.1). We then state a similar result for the increments in time (lemma 5.2). Using the inf-sup condition (proposition 4.7), we infer from it some estimates on the pressure (theorem 5.2).

Lemma 5.1. *For all* $m \in \{0,\dots,N\}$ *and* $n \in \{0,\dots,N\}$ *we have*

$$(\mathbf{u}_h^m, \nabla_h p_h^n) = 0\,, \qquad |\mathbf{u}_h^m|^2 - |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m|^2 + |\mathbf{u}_h^m - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m|^2 = 0.$$

PROOF. First, using propositions 3.1 and 4.6, we get

$$(\mathbf{u}_h^m, \nabla_h p_h^n) = -(p_h^n, \mathrm{div}_h\mathbf{u}_h^m) = 0.$$

Thus we deduce from (3.4)

$$2\,(\mathbf{u}_h^m, \mathbf{u}_h^m - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m) = -\frac{4\,k}{3}\left(\mathbf{u}_h^m, \nabla_h(p_h^m - p_h^{m-1})\right) = 0.$$

Using the algebraic identity $2\,a\,(a-b)=a^2-b^2+(a-b)^2$ we get

$$2\,(\mathbf{u}_h^m,\mathbf{u}_h^m-\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m)=|\mathbf{u}_h^m|^2-|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m|^2+|\mathbf{u}_h^m-\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m|^2=0. \qquad \blacksquare$$

We introduce the following hypothesis on the initial data.

$$(\mathbf{H1})\quad \text{There exists } C>0 \text{ such that } \quad |\mathbf{u}_h^0|+|\mathbf{u}_h^1|+k|\nabla_h p_h^1|\le C.$$

Hypothesis **(H1)** is fulfilled if we set $\mathbf{u}_h^0=\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}_0$ and we use a semi-implicit Euler scheme to compute $\mathbf{u}_h^1$. We have the following result.

Theorem 5.1. *We assume that the initial values of the scheme fulfill* **(H1)**. *For all* $m\in\{2,\dots,N\}$ *we have*

$$|\mathbf{u}_h^m|^2+k\sum_{n=2}^{m}\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^n\|_h^2\le C.$$

Proof. Let $m\in\{2,\dots,N\}$ and $n\in\{1,\dots,m-1\}$. Taking the scalar product of (3.2) with $4\,k\,\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}$ we get

$$\left(\frac{3\,\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}-4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n+\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}}{2k},4\,k\,\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\right)-\frac{4\,k}{\mathrm{Re}}\,(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1},\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1})$$
$$+4\,k\,\mathrm{b}_h(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n-\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1},\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1},\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1})+4\,k\,(\nabla_h p_h^n,\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1})=4\,k\,(\mathbf{f}_h^{n+1},\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}). \tag{5.1}$$

First of all, using lemma 5.1, we get as in [12]

$$\begin{aligned}&4\,k\left(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1},\frac{3\,\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}-4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n+\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}}{2\,k}\right)\\&=|\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}|^2-|\mathbf{u}_h^n|^2+6\,|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}-\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}|^2+|2\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}-\mathbf{u}_h^n|^2-|2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n-\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}|^2\\&+|\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}-2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n+\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}|^2.\end{aligned}$$

According to proposition 4.8 we have $-\frac{4\,k}{\mathrm{Re}}\,(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1},\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1})=\frac{4\,k}{\mathrm{Re}}\,\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h^2$. Also, using lemma 5.1 and (3.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}4\,k\,(\nabla_h p_h^n,\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1})&=4\,k\,(\nabla_h p_h^n,\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}-\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1})\\&=\frac{4\,k^2}{3}\,(|\nabla p_h^{n+1}|^2-|\nabla p_h^n|^2-|\nabla p_h^{n+1}-\nabla p_h^n|^2).\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying (3.4) by $4k\nabla_h(p_h^{n+1}-p_h^n)$ and using the Young inequality we get

$$\frac{4\,k^2}{3}\,|\nabla(p_h^{n+1}-p_h^n)|^2\le 3\,|\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}-\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}|^2.$$

According to proposition 4.2 we have $4\,k\,\mathrm{b}_h(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n-\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1},\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1},\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1})\ge 0$. At last using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (2.5) and (3.1) we have

$$4\,k\,(\mathbf{f}_h^{n+1},\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1})\le 4\,k\,|\mathbf{f}_h^{n+1}|\,|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}|\le C\,k\,\|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2)}\,\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h.$$

Using the Young inequality we get

$$4\,k\,(\mathbf{f}_h^{n+1},\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1})\le 3\,k\,\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h^2+C\,k\,\|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2)}^2.$$

Let us plug these estimates into (5.1). We get

$$\begin{aligned}&|\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}|^2-|\mathbf{u}_h^n|^2+|2\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}-\mathbf{u}_h^n|^2-|2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n-\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}|^2+|\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}-2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n+\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}|^2\\&+3\,|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}-\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}|^2+k\,\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h^2+\frac{4\,k^2}{3}\,(|\nabla_h p_h^{n+1}|^2-|\nabla_h p_h^n|^2)\le C\,k.\end{aligned}$$

Summing from $n = 1$ to $m - 1$ we have

$$|\mathbf{u}_h^m|^2 + |2\,\mathbf{u}_h^m - \mathbf{u}_h^{m-1}|^2 + 3\sum_{n=1}^{m-1} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1} - \mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}|^2 + k\sum_{n=1}^{m-1} \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h^2 + \frac{4\,k^2}{3}\,|\nabla_h p_h^m|^2$$
$$\leq C + 4\,|\mathbf{u}_h^1|^2 + |2\,\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \mathbf{u}_h^0|^2 + k^2\,|\nabla_h p_h^1|^2.$$

Using hypothesis **(H1)** we get the result. ∎

We now want to estimate the computed pressure. From now on, we make the following hypothesis on the data

$$\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2)\,, \qquad \mathbf{f}_t \in L^2(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2)\,, \qquad \mathbf{u}_0 \in \mathbf{H}^2 \cap \mathbf{H}_0^1\,, \qquad \operatorname{div}\mathbf{u}_0 = 0.$$

For all sequence $(q^m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ we define the sequence $(\delta q^m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*}$ by setting $\delta q^m = q^m - q^{m-1}$ for $m \geq 1$. We set $\boldsymbol{\delta} = (\delta)^2$. If the data $\mathbf{u}_0$ and $\mathbf{f}$ fulfill a compatibility condition [13] there exists a solution $(\mathbf{u}, p)$ to the equations (1.1)–(1.2) such that

$$\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbf{H}^2)\,, \qquad \mathbf{u}_t \in \mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2)\,, \qquad \nabla p \in \mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2).$$

We introduce the following hypothesis on the initial values of the scheme: there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\textbf{(H2)} \qquad |\mathbf{u}_h^0 - \mathbf{u}_0| + \frac{1}{h}\,\|\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \mathbf{u}(t_1)\|_\infty + |p_h^1 - p(t_1)| \leq C\,h\,, \qquad |\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \mathbf{u}_h^0| \leq C\,k.$$

One checks easily that this hypothesis implies **(H1)**. We have the following result.

Lemma 5.2. *We assume that the initial values of the scheme fulfill* **(H2)**. *Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $m \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$*

$$\frac{1}{k}\,|\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^m| \leq C. \tag{5.2}$$

Proof. We prove the result by induction. The result holds for $m = 1$ thanks to hypothesis **(H2)**. Let us consider the case $m = 2$. We set $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^1 = \mathbf{u}_h^1$. Let $\mathbf{u}_h^{-1} \in \mathbf{P}_0$ given by

$$\mathbf{u}_h^{-1} = 4\,\mathbf{u}_h^0 - 3\,\mathbf{u}_h^1 + \frac{2\,k}{\mathrm{Re}}\,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\mathbf{u}_h^1 - 2\,k\,\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^0, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^1) - 2\,k\,\nabla_h p_h^1 - 2\,k\,\mathbf{f}_h^1. \tag{5.3}$$

We substract this equation from equation (3.4) written for $n = 1$. Since

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \mathbf{u}_h^0, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2) - \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^0, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^1) = \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^1 - 2\,\mathbf{u}_h^0, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2) + \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^0, \boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2)\,,$$

upon setting $\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0 = \mathbf{u}_h^0 - \mathbf{u}_h^{-1}$, we get

$$\frac{3\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2 - 4\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 + \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0}{2\,k} - \frac{1}{\mathrm{Re}}\,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h(\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2) + \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^1 - 2\,\mathbf{u}_h^0, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2) + \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^0, \boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2) = \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{f}_h^2.$$

Taking the scalar product with $4\,k\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} &2\left(3\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2 - 4\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 + \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0, \boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2\right) - \frac{1}{\mathrm{Re}}\left(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h(\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2), \boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2\right) \\ &+4\,k\,\mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^0, \boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2, \boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2) + 4\,k\,\mathrm{b}_h(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^1 - 2\,\mathbf{u}_h^0, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2, \boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2) = 4\,k\,(\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{f}_h^2, \boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2). \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

According to proposition 4.3 we have

$$4\,k\,|\mathrm{b}_h(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^1 - 2\,\mathbf{u}_h^0, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2, \boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2)| \leq C\,k\,|2\,\mathbf{u}_h^1 - 2\,\mathbf{u}_h^0|\,\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2\|_h\,\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2\|_h\,;$$

so that, using hypothesis **(H2)**

$$4\,k\,\left|\mathrm{b}_h(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^1 - 2\,\mathbf{u}_h^0, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2, \boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2)\right| \leq C\,k^2\,\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2\|_h\,\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2\|_h.$$

From the Young inequality and theorem 5.1 we deduce

$$4\,k\,\left|\mathrm{b}_h(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \mathbf{u}_h^0, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2 - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^1)\right| \leq \frac{k}{\mathrm{Re}}\,\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2\|_h^2 + C\,k^3\,\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2\|_h^2 \leq \frac{k}{\mathrm{Re}}\,\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2\|_h^2 + C\,k^2.$$

On the other hand

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{f}_h^2 = \mathbf{f}_h^2 - \mathbf{f}_h^1 = \Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{f}(t_2) - \Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{f}(t_1) = \Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \mathbf{f}_t(s)\, ds\right).$$

Since $\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}$ is stable for the Ł^2 norm, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$|\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{f}_h^2| \leq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\mathbf{f}_t(s)|\, ds \leq \sqrt{k}\left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\mathbf{f}_t(s)|^2\, ds\right)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{k}\, \|\mathbf{f}_t\|_{L^2(0,T;\text{Ł}^2)}.$$

Thus

$$4\, k\, |(\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{f}_h^2, \boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2)| \leq 4\, k\, |\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{f}_h^2|\, |\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2| \leq C\, k^{3/2}\, |\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2|.$$

So that, using (2.5) and the Young inequality

$$4\, k\, |(\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{f}_h^2, \boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2)| \leq C\, k^{3/2}\, \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2\|_h \leq \frac{k}{\mathrm{Re}}\, \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^2\|_h^2 + C\, k^2.$$

The other terms in (5.4) are dealt with as in the prooof of theroem 5.1. We get

$$|\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^2|^2 \leq |\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1|^2 + |2\, \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0|^2. \tag{5.5}$$

We know ((5.2) for $m = 1$) that $|\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1|^2 \leq C\, k^2$. It remains to estimate the term $|2\, \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0|^2$. According to (5.3)

$$2\, \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0 = -\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 + \frac{2\, k}{\mathrm{Re}}\, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h \mathbf{u}_h^1 - 2\, k\, \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^0, \mathbf{u}_h^1) - 2\, k\, \nabla_h p_h^1 - 2\, k\, \mathbf{f}_h^1\,;$$

by taking the scalar product with $2\, \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \mathbf{u}_h^0$ and using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} |2\, \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0|^2 \quad &\leq \quad 2\, k\left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1|}{2\, k} + \frac{1}{\mathrm{Re}}\, |\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h \mathbf{u}_h^1| + |\nabla_h p_h^1| + |\mathbf{f}_h^1|\right)|2\, \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0| \\ &+ \quad 2\, k\, \left|\mathrm{b}(\mathbf{u}_h^0, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^1, 2\, \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0)\right|. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Let us bound the terms between braces. First, we have

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h \mathbf{u}_h^1 = \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\big(\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)\big) + \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\big(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)\big).$$

On one hand, according to proposition 4.8

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\big(\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)\big)\right|^2 \quad &= \quad \Big(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\big(\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)\big), \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\big(\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)\big)\Big) \\ &\leq \quad \|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\big(\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)\big)\|_h\, \|\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)\|_h. \end{aligned}$$

Applying proposition 2.1 we get

$$\left|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\big(\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)\big)\right|^2 \leq \frac{C}{h^2}\, |\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\big(\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)\big)|\, |\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)|.$$

Using the embedding $\text{Ł}^\infty \subset \text{Ł}^2$ we have

$$|\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)| = |\widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}(\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \mathbf{u}(t_1))| \leq \|\widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}(\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \mathbf{u}(t_1))\|_\infty\,;$$

since $\widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}$ is stable for the Ł^∞ norm, we get using hypothesis **(H2)**

$$|\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)| \leq \|\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \mathbf{u}(t_1)\|_\infty \leq C\, h^2.$$

Therefore $\left|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\big(\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)\big)\right| \leq C$. And according to proposition 4.9

$$\left|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\big(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)\big)\right| \leq C\, \|\mathbf{u}(t_1)\| \leq C\, \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbf{H}^2)}.$$

Hence $|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h \mathbf{u}_h^1| \leq C$. Let us now bound the pressure term in (5.6). We have

$$\nabla_h p_h^1 = \nabla_h\big(p_h^1 - \widetilde{\Pi}_{P_0}p(t_1)\big) + \Big(\nabla_h\big(\widetilde{\Pi}_{P_0}p(t_1)\big) - \Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\nabla p(t_1)\Big) + \Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\nabla p(t_1).$$

According to proposition 4.4 we have $\left|\nabla_h\big(p_h^1 - \widetilde{\Pi}_{P_0}p(t_1)\big)\right| \le \frac{C}{h}\,|p_h^1 - \widetilde{\Pi}_{P_0}p(t_1)|$. Using (2.8) we get

$$\left|\nabla_h\big(p_h^1 - \widetilde{\Pi}_{P_0}p(t_1)\big)\right| \le C\,\|p(t_1)\|_2 \le C\,\|p\|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbf{H}^2)}.$$

Since $\mathbf{P}_0$ is stable for the L^2 norm we have $|\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\nabla p(t_1)| \le |\nabla p(t_1)| \le \|p\|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbf{H}^1)}$. Using proposition 4.5 to treat last term we get $|\nabla_h p_h^1| \le C$. And according to (3.1) and (5.2) for $m = 1$ we have $\frac{|\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1|}{2\,k} + |\mathbf{f}_h^1| \le C$. We are left with the term $\left|\mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^0, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^1, 2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0)\right|$ in (5.6). We use the following splitting

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^0, \mathbf{u}_h^1) &= \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^0 - \Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_h^1) + \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h\big(\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_h^1 - \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)\big) \\ &+ \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h\big(\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}_0, \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)\big). \end{aligned}$$

Let us take the scalar product with $2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0$. We get

$$\mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^0, \mathbf{u}_h^1, 2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0) = B_1 + B_2 + B_3$$

with

$$B_1 = \mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^0 - \Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_h^1, 2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0)\,,$$

$$B_2 = \mathrm{b}_h\big(\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_h^1 - \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1), 2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0\big)\,,$$

and

$$B_3 = \Big(\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h\big(\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}_0, \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)\big), 2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0\Big).$$

Applying propositions 2.1 and 4.3 we have

$$|B_1| \le \frac{C}{h}\,|\mathbf{u}_h^0 - \Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}_0|\,\|\mathbf{u}_h^1\|_h\,|2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0|.$$

According to (2.8) and (2.13) we have have

$$|\mathbf{u}_h^0 - \Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}_0| = |\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}^0 - \Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}_0| \le |\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{u}_0| + |\mathbf{u}_0 - \Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}_0| \le C\,h\,\|\mathbf{u}_0\|_1.$$

According to proposition 4.8 and (2.5)

$$\|\mathbf{u}_h^1\|_h^2 = -(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\mathbf{u}_h^1, \mathbf{u}_h^1) \le |\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\mathbf{u}_h^1|\,|\mathbf{u}_h^1| \le C\,|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\mathbf{u}_h^1|\,\|\mathbf{u}_h^1\|_h\,;$$

since $|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\mathbf{u}_h^1|$ is bounded we get $\|\mathbf{u}_h^1\|_h \le C$. Hence $|B_1| \le C\,|2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0|$. In a similar way, using propositions 2.1 and 4.3, we get

$$|B_2| \le \frac{C}{h^2}\,|\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}_0|\,|\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)|\,|2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0|.$$

We have $|\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}_0| \le |\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{u}_0| + |\mathbf{u}_0| \le C\,h\,\|\mathbf{u}_0\|_1 + |\mathbf{u}_0| \le C\,\|\mathbf{u}_0\|_1$. Using moreover (5) we get $|B_2| \le C\,|2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0|$. Lastly using the following splitting

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h\big(\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}_0, \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)\big) &= \Big(\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h\big(\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}_0, \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)\big) - \Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}\big(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}(t_1)\big)\Big) \\ &+ \Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}\big(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}(t_1)\big)\,, \end{aligned}$$

we have $B_3 = B_{31} + B_{32}$ with

$$B_{31} = \Big(\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h\big(\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}_0, \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)\big) - \Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}\big(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}(t_1)\big), 2\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0\Big)\,,$$

$$B_{32} = \Big(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}\big(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}(t_1)\big), 2\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0\Big).$$

We have

$$|B_{31}| \le \|\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h\big(\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}_0, \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{u}(t_1)\big) - \Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}\big(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}(t_1)\big)\|_{-1,h}\,\|2\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0\|_h$$

So that, using proposition 4.1 $|B_{31}| \leq C\,h\,\|\mathbf{u}_0\|_2\,\|\mathbf{u}(t_1)\|_2\,\|2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0\|_h$. Using proposition 2.1 we obtain

$$|B_{31}| \leq C\,\|\mathbf{u}_0\|_2\,\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbf{H}^2)}\,|2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0|.$$

Let us now bound B_{32}. Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the stability of $\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}$ for the $\mathbb{L}^2$ norm, we have

$$|B_{32}| \leq \left|\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}\big(\mathbf{u}_0,\mathbf{u}(t_1)\big)\right|\;|2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0| \leq \left|\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}\big(\mathbf{u}_0,\mathbf{u}(t_1)\big)\right|\;|2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0|.$$

Integrating by parts, we deduce from (4.1)

$$\left|\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}\big(\mathbf{u}_0,\mathbf{u}(t_1)\big)\right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{2}|\mathbf{u}_0\cdot\nabla u_i(t_1)| \leq |\mathbf{u}_0|\,\|\mathbf{u}(t_1)\|_2 \leq C\,|\mathbf{u}_0|\,\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbf{H}^2)}.$$

Thus $|B_{32}| \leq C\,|2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0|$. By gathering the estimates for B_1, B_2, B_3 we get

$$\left|\mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^0,\mathbf{u}_h^1,2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0)\right| \leq C.$$

Thus we have bounded the right-hand side in (5.6). We infer from it

$$|2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^1 - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^0| \leq C\,k.$$

Plugging this estimate into (5.5) and using (5.2) for $m = 1$, we get (5.2) for $m = 2$. Let $m \in \{3,\ldots,N-1\}$. We assume that the induction hypothesis is satisfied up to rank $n = m-1$. Let us substract equation (3.2) with the same for $n-1$. Since the operator $\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h$ is bilinear we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{3\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^n + \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}}{2\,k} &- \frac{1}{\mathrm{Re}}\,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h(\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}) + \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^n - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1},\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1})\\ &+ \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n - \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1},\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}) + \nabla_h(\delta p_h^n) = \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{f}_h^{n+1}.\end{aligned}$$

Let us take the scalar product with $4\,k\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}$. We get

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\frac{3\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^n + \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}}{2\,k},4\,k\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\right) - \frac{4\,k}{\mathrm{Re}}\left(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h(\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}),\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\right)\\ &\quad +4\,k\,\mathrm{b}_h(2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^n - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1},\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1},\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}) + 4\,k\,\mathrm{b}_h(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n - \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1},\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1},\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1})\\ &\qquad +4\,k\left(\nabla_h(\delta p_h^n),\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\right) = 4\,k\,(\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{f}_h^{n+1},\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}).\end{aligned}$$

According to proposition 4.3 we have

$$\left|4\,k\,\mathrm{b}_h(2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^n - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1},\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1},\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1})\right| \leq C\,k\,|2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^n - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}|\,\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h\,\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h.$$

Using the induction hypothesis we get

$$\left|4\,k\,\mathrm{b}_h(2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^n - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1},\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1},\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1})\right| \leq C\,k^2\,\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h\,\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h.$$

Using the Young inequality and (5.1) we infer that

$$\left|4\,k\,\mathrm{b}_h(2\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^n - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1},\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1},\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1})\right| \leq \frac{k}{\mathrm{Re}}\,\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h^2 + C\,k^2.$$

The other terms are treated like the case $m = 2$. We finally obtain (5.2). ■

Theorem 5.2. *We assume that the initial values of the scheme fulfull* **(H2)**. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $m \in \{2,\ldots,N\}$*

$$k\sum_{n=2}^{m}|\Pi_{P_1^{nc}}p_h^n|^2 \leq C.$$

Proof. Let $m \in \{2, \dots, N\}$. We set $n = m-1$. Using the inf-sup condition (4.7) and proposition 4.6, we get that there exists $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0 \backslash \{\mathbf{0}\}$ such that

$$C\,\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h\,|\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} p_h^{n+1}| \le -(p_h^{n+1}, \mathrm{div}_h\,\mathbf{v}_h) = (\nabla_h p_h^{n+1}, \mathbf{v}_h). \tag{5.7}$$

Plugging (3.4) into (3.2) we have

$$\nabla_h p_h^{n+1} = -\frac{3\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n + \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}}{2\,k} + \frac{1}{\mathrm{Re}}\,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1} - \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n - \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}) + \mathbf{f}_h^{n+1}.$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}(\nabla_h p_h^{n+1}, \mathbf{v}_h) = &-\left(\frac{3\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n + \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}}{2\,k}, \mathbf{v}_h\right) + \frac{1}{\mathrm{Re}}\left(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}, \mathbf{v}_h\right)\\ &- \mathrm{b}_h(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n - \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}, \mathbf{v}_h) + (\mathbf{f}_h^{n+1}, \mathbf{v}_h).\end{aligned}$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (2.5) and (3.1) we have

$$\left|\left(\frac{3\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n + \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}}{2\,k}, \mathbf{v}_h\right)\right| \le C\,\left|\frac{3\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n + \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}}{2\,k}\right|\,\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h$$

and

$$(\mathbf{f}_h^{n+1}, \mathbf{v}_h) \le |\mathbf{f}_h^{n+1}|\,|\mathbf{v}_h| \le C\,|\mathbf{v}_h| \le C\,\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h\,,$$

Thanks to proposition 4.3 and theorem 5.1 we have

$$\left|\mathrm{b}_h(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n - \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}, \mathbf{v}_h)\right| \le \left(2\,|\mathbf{u}_h^n| + |\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}|\right)\,\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h\,\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h \le C\,\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h\,\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h.$$

And according to proposition 4.8 we have $\left(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}, \mathbf{v}_h\right) \le \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h\,\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h$. Thus

$$(\nabla_h p_h^{n+1}, \mathbf{v}_h) \le C + C\left(\frac{|3\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n + \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}|}{2\,k} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h\right)\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h.$$

Comparing with (5.7) we get

$$|\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} p_h^{n+1}| \le C + C\left(\frac{|3\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n + \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}|}{2\,k} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h\right).$$

Squaring and summing from $n = 1$ to $m-1$ we obtain

$$k\sum_{n=2}^{m} |\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} p_h^n|^2 \le C + C\,k\sum_{n=1}^{m-1} \frac{|3\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n + \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}|^2}{4\,k^2} + C\,k\sum_{n=1}^{m-1} \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h^2.$$

The last term on the right-hand side is bounded, thanks to theorem 5.1. And since

$$3\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n + \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1} = 3(\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} - \mathbf{u}_h^n) - (\mathbf{u}_h^n - \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}) = 3\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} - \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^n$$

we deduce from lemma 5.2

$$k\sum_{n=1}^{m-1} \frac{|3\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n + \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}|^2}{4\,k^2} \le C\,k\sum_{n=1}^{m} \frac{|\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^n|^2}{k^2} \le C. \qquad \blacksquare$$

References

[1] S. Boivin , F. Cayre, J. M. Herard, A finite volume method to solve the Navier-Stokes equations for incompressible flows on unstructured meshes, Int. J. Therm. Sci., 39 (2000) 806-825.

[2] S. C. Brenner, L. R. Scott, The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods, Springer, 2002.

[3] F. Brezzi, M. Fortin, Mixed and Hybrid Finite Element Methods, Springer-Verlag, 1991.

[4] J. Chorin, On the convergence of discrete approximations to the Navier-Stokes equations, Math. Comp. 23 (1969) 341-353.

[5] R. Eymard, T. Gallouët, R. Herbin, A cell-centered finite-volume approximation for anisotropic diffusion operators on unstructured meshes in any space dimension, IMA J. Numer. Anal. 26 (2006) 326-353.

[6] R. Eymard, T. Gallouët and R. Herbin, *Finite volume methods*. In Handbook of Numerical Analysis, P.G. Ciarlet and J.L. Lions eds, North-Holland, 2000.

[7] R. Eymard and R. Herbin, A staggered finite volume scheme on general meshes for the Navier-Stokes equations in two space dimensions, Int.J. Finite Volumes (2005).

[8] R. Eymard, J. C. Latché and R. Herbin, Convergence analysis of a colocated finite volume scheme for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations on general 2D or 3D meshes, preprint LATP (2004).

[9] S. Faure, Stability of a colocated finite volume scheme for the Navier-Stokes equations, Num. Methods Partial Differential Equations 21(2) (2005) 242-271.

[10] V. Girault and P. A. Raviart, Finite Element Methods for Navier-Stokes Equations: Theory and Algorithms, Springer-Verlag, 1986.

[11] J.L. Guermond, Some implementations of projection methods for Navier-Stokes equations, M2AN 30(5) (1996) 637-667.

[12] J. L. Guermond, Un résultat de convergence l'ordre deux en temps pour l'approximation des équations de Navier-Stokes par une technique de projection, M2AN 33(1) (1999) 169-189.

[13] J. G. Heywood and R. Rannacher, Finite element approximation of the nonstationary Navier-Stokes problem. I. Regularity of solutions and second-order error estimates for spatial discretization, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 19(26) (1982) 275-311.

[14] D. Kim and H. Choi, A second-order time-accurate finit volume method for unsteady incompressible flow on hybrid unstructured grids, J. Comput. Phys. 162 (2000) 411-428.

[15] R. Temam, Sur l'approximation de la solution des équations de Navier-Stokes par la méthode de pas fractionnaires II, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 33 (1969) 377-385.

[16] S. Zimmermann, Étude et implémentation de méthodes de volumes finis pour les fluides incompressibles, PhD, Blaise Pascal University, 2006.

Department of Mathematics, Centrale Lyon University, 63177 Ecully, FRANCE
E-mail: `Sebastien.Zimmermann@ec-lyon.fr`